

relevant amendments in order. When a motion to proceed is made in such form, the consideration of that motion would be limited to 2 hours. If the Senate adopted that motion, then Senators would have until 1 p.m. the following session day to file relevant, first-degree amendments and until 1 p.m. the session day after that to file relevant, second-degree amendments.

This procedure would guarantee that any Senator who has a timely filed, relevant amendment could offer that amendment prior to final passage, even if the amendment tree is filled. For example, if the Senate is considering a bill under this procedure and the amendment tree is filled, following disposition of all pending amendments but prior to the third reading, it would be in order for any Senator with a relevant, timely filed amendment to call up that amendment. Once pending, that amendment would need to be disposed of before final passage.

While this procedure would expedite the process to begin consideration of a bill, it would not abandon the essential principle that a supermajority is necessary to bring debate to a close on a bill in the Senate. Nothing under this procedure would deny Senators his or her right to extended debate on a bill, unless, of course, 60 or more Senators vote to invoke cloture. Aside from the filing deadlines, the only substantive change from the current cloture process would be the application of a relevancy standard rather than the conventional germaneness standard. Only relevant amendments would be in order only if the majority leader opted to use this alternative approach to moving to proceed.

This procedure would not be needed or even appropriate for every bill that is placed on the calendar. But for some bills, the majority leader might view this alternative procedure as a useful tool that could help both the majority and the minority achieve their aims. And should this alternative procedure prove to be ineffective, the majority leader could always abandon it for regular order, and if the right to get votes on relevant amendments is abused by filing a dilatory number of relevant amendments, the majority leader would simply not utilize the option.

As I said, an election season is upon us. We will soon recess, and only after November 6 will we know who will hold a majority in this body. My support for ending the current motion to proceed process will be there after the election, regardless which party controls the Senate in the next Congress. My goal is not to gain partisan advantage but to protect the unique role of the Senate. Increasingly, after facing years of excessive obstruction, some Members on my side of the aisle see the filibuster as an archaic procedure that prevents the Senate from addressing the pressing needs of the Nation. I suspect that some of my friends in the minority today, if in the majority sometime in the future, will find the filibuster

equally frustrating to their own efforts. We face an increasing danger that, in order to end the gridlock that prevents either side from offering solutions to the challenges we face, pressure to severely reduce minority rights will become irresistible.

If we are to preserve the Senate's function as a check on haste, as a haven for minority views, we must ensure that protection of minority rights is no longer a barrier to any and all action. Limiting excessive filibusters on the motion to proceed is one modest change we can make that addresses this crisis without changing the Senate's fundamental character. I ask my colleagues to consider carefully whether a change in the present might be necessary to avoid more radical change in the future.

REMEMBERING NEIL A. ARMSTRONG

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I rise today in celebration of the life and career of Neil A. Armstrong. Americans and people around the world paused when Mr. Armstrong passed away on August 25, 2012, to recall his heroic accomplishments and historic legacy.

Neil Armstrong is remembered as a man who pushed the frontiers of space exploration and engineering. Over the course of his life and service to the Nation, he promoted the idea of never doubting what is possible. He inspired countless young men and women to pursue careers in science and engineering, many of whom became aeronautics workers at facilities like the Stennis Space Center in Mississippi.

Mr. Armstrong was born in Wapakoneta, OH, on August 5, 1930. He received a Bachelor of Science in Aerospace Engineering from Perdue University, a Master of Science in Aerospace Engineering from the University of California, and received honorary doctorates from multiple universities.

Mr. Armstrong embarked on a remarkable career that would involve his flying more than 200 different models of aircraft including jets, rockets, helicopters and gliders.

From 1949 to 1952, Mr. Armstrong served as a naval aviator, and in 1955 joined the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, now the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. From 1955 through 1972, he served as an engineer, test pilot, astronaut, and administrator for our Nation's ambitious space program.

Mr. Armstrong's transfer to astronaut status in 1962 led to his performing the first successful docking of two vehicles in space in March 1966 as the command pilot for Gemini 8. Mr. Armstrong subsequently became commander for Apollo 11, the first manned lunar mission, and was the first man to land a craft on the moon. At 10:56 p.m. ET on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong became the first man to step on the surface of the moon. It was one of the defining moments of the 20th century and

one of the proudest days for the American people.

Following his career with NASA, Mr. Armstrong was a Professor of Aerospace Engineering at the University of Cincinnati between 1971 and 1979. Mr. Armstrong was decorated by 17 countries and was the recipient of many special honors including: the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Congressional Gold Medal, the Congressional Space Medal of Honor, the Explorers Club Medal, the Robert H. Goddard Memorial Trophy, the NASA Distinguished Service Medal, the Harmon International Aviation Trophy, the Royal Geographic Society's Gold Medal, the Federal Aeronautique Internationale's Gold Space Medal, the American Astronautical Society Flight Achievement Award, the Robert J. Collier Trophy, the AIAA Astronautics Award, the Octave Chanute Award, and the John J. Montgomery Award.

Mr. Armstrong will be remembered not only for his famous words as he stepped foot on the moon—"That's one small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind"—but more importantly for inspiring generations of people around the world to explore and push the boundaries of what they believe is possible. Neil Armstrong was a true American hero who will be missed by many, but never forgotten.

CAPACITY TO IMPLEMENT THE ACA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Supreme Court decision on the Affordable Care Act has put the brakes on Medicaid expansion for now.

The Federal Government can no longer force States to expand their Medicaid programs.

With the expansion and the billions of dollars that States would have had to spend on hold, and as we look at solutions to address our 16 trillion dollar national debt, now is a good time for us to step back and ask what role health care should play for States in our Federal system.

Mr. President, as of today, the primary function of a state is health administration—not primary and secondary education, not public safety, not roads and bridges.

According to the National Association of State Budget Officers, Medicaid is the single largest spending line in state budgets at 23.6 percent.

The economic downturn and high unemployment have resulted in an increase in Medicaid enrollment as individuals lose job-based coverage and incomes decline.

Medicaid enrollment increased by 5.1 percent during fiscal 2011 and is estimated to increase by 3.3 percent in fiscal 2012.

In governors' recommended budgets for fiscal 2013, Medicaid enrollment would rise by an additional 3.6 percent.

This would represent a 12.5 percent increase in Medicaid enrollment over this three year period.